Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors and to place the case in proper US form. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

Enclosed herewith is a PTO-1449 listing the two German references cited in the International Search Report that do not have US equivalents already of record. Copies of these two German references are also filed herewith It is noted that DE '249 has been cited in the PTO-892 with the last action; this filing merely makes the full German version of record. It is also noted that the International Search Report incorrectly cites DE 1015574 when actually DE 10155174, which is the equivalent of US 2004/0216652, should have been cited. DE 1015574 relates to irrelevant subject matter, namely an organic chemical composition.

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporation into it of the subject matter of now canceled claims 2 and 3. The other claims have been amended to make them better comply with US practice and to overcome some formal problems.

The claims stand rejected on DE 203 02 249 of Mueller, which was cited in the International Search Report. According to FIG. 3 and as described on page 7, last paragraph to page 8, first paragraph of the English translation of the Utility Model, the arresting cables 40 of Mueller are merely fastened to the retaining ring 34 without any clamping device that allows the cable to slide back slightly by changing shape (see FIG. 1). According to Mueller, at their lower ends the arresting cables are anchored in an energy-absorbing device that, for example, may be a traction device having a tension spring and that exerts a stretching tensile force on the arresting cable 40. Amended claim 1 clearly defines over this reference by defining a structure and materials nowhere suggested therein.

US 2003/0115830 of Jackson discloses a building having on its roof rollers (pulleys 2) over which the cables 3 are guided. Beams 2 allow the cables to be tightened, as illustrated in FIG. 4C, for example. Aside from the intrinsic weight of the cables which exerts a tensile force, Jackson does not address traction cable tensioning. This is also true if the tensile stress is increased as the result of load on the cables. A key factor is that according to the present invention, the clamped cable ends are able to "give" over a small distance, which is not possible for a fixed cable clamping or attachment. This does not involve just the yield point to which a cable may be extended under tensile load,

since in the event of a terrorist attack by aircraft this yield point is reached very rapidly, and fixedly clamped cables would thus break relatively quickly and therefore not provide sufficient resistance. Instead, and as described on page 3 of the English translation of this case beginning on line 10, in the event of tensile load the wire cable is pulled into a tapering cone, wherein initially additional frictional forces and subsequent deformation forces act. Such deformation is described on page 4, first paragraph of the translation. In both cases, squeezing of the cable in a clamping device causes the cable to be flexibly mounted in the clamping device, the resistance from the clamping device becoming greater with increasing tensile load, since the cross-sectional deformation of the cable can be moved outward, initially with low expenditure of tensile force, and subsequently, i.e., the farther the cable is pulled from the clamping device, with greater tensile force. This is now clearly defined in amended claim 1.

Claims 13 through 15 of the present application concern refinements of the tensionable network for which no independent patent protection is sought.

US 6,487,757 of Stubler relates to a system for connecting a cable to a building, which must be categorized as foreign to the classification in question. For this reason, one skilled in the art seeking solutions for a cable-clamping system for building protection would not draw upon this document. As

disclosed in column 1, lines 14 and 15 of Stubler, building structures such as tension leg offshore platforms and suspension or cable-stayed bridges are referenced as application examples. The wires described therein which compose the cables are intended to withstand tensile loads, never to release. The only requirement for the clamping device is that the cables must be securely anchored thereto. The clamping device by which this is to be achieved is composed of elements shown in FIG. 3 having multiple individual plates 15 with passages 20 having half the cross section of the wires. Thus, two oppositely situated passages 20 form an opening having a circular cross section in which the wire, which has approximately the same cross section, engages. The overall element 12 is fixed in place by wedges 27 and 28. It is easily recognized and also described that the top sides 16 and 17 each have flat area sections between the passages 20 that lie against a corresponding area section of the adjacent plate, thus preventing the circular cross sections 20 from changing, i.e. constricting, as a result of compression of the wedges. In other words, the clamping device 12 is intended only to secure the wire ends without the ends of the cable, i.e. wires, being moved out. If the clamping device according to Stubler were used in an apparatus according to Mueller, the cable ends would be fixedly clamped in an inflexible manner. The difference between the design according to Stubler and the tapering of the end of the wire cable (in the direction of the tensile force), or, stated more precisely, the

frustoconical expansion of the end of the wire cable toward the end, according to amended claim 1 lies in the fact that in the present invention the cable rests directly in the clamping device, whereas in Stubler the cable, i.e. the wires, is inserted into a clamping element that is fastened in a clamping device by wedges. In contrast, the present invention functions without such wedges as a result of the conical design of the wire end. The examiner's conclusion in section 30 that it is obvious that the clamping device according to Stubler must be composed of a material that is harder than the cable, is speculative and has no basis in fact. In any event, Stubler contains no statements concerning the hardness of the wires or the hardness of the material of the clamping device.

It is incorrect that, as asserted by the examiner in section item 31 of the office action, any additional force in the direction of traction results in plastic deformation of cables. As demonstrated in FIG. 1 of the present application, plastic deformation of a cable until the yield point is reached and the cable breaks is not intended; rather, it is plastic deformation by means of which the cable in the clamping device takes up a certain amount of slack.

The comments concerning claim 5 in section 32 of the office action also do not take into consideration the conicity of the cable or wire end, which is not mentioned in Stubler. The fact that Stubler relates to a completely different fastening system is

evidenced in particular by the description in Stubler in column 3, line 58 to column 4, line 6, that the essential basis of the connecting system is that an adhesive is applied in each of the passages of the plates 15 before the wires 9 are inserted into these passages and the plates are stacked on top of one another. Only then are the wedges 27 inserted. Column 4, lines 1, 2 states that all that is then required is for the adhesive to dry. The clamping force acts solely on the apparatus 12 in which the cables are glued. The wire ends, which the examiner has identified in section 34 of the office action, likewise do not rest in the guide, so that when the tensile force increases, the resistance force opposed by the clamping elements increases proportionally. In other words, in the clamping device according to Stubler it does not matter at all whether the wire ends have a cylindrical or conical design. In any event, Stubler does not teach integration of this conical wire cable end into the clamping system.

For these reasons the amended claims are clearly allowable over the cited art under §102 and §103. Allowance of all claims and passage to issue are in order.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

K.F. Ross P.C.

/Andrew Wilford/

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

03 February 2009
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: *email@kfrpc.com*

Enclosure: Marked Specification
Clean Specification
Replacement Drawing (4 sheets)
PTO-1449